

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3-21 and 23-26 are pending, of which claims 1, 9 and 23 are independent.

Claims 1, 3-5, 9-11 and 23 have been amended to correct informalities in the claim language and to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. Claims 24-26 have been added. No new matter has been introduced.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the title and the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made to the title and the specification overcome these objections.

Objection to the Claims

Claims 1-2 were objected to because of the informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that amendments made to claim 1 overcome this objection and the cancellation of claim 2 renders this objection moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7, 9-13 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Duggal (US 6,515,314). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner asserts that the photo-luminescent material of Duggal corresponds to the claimed inorganic phosphor material (layer as amended) or particle of the present disclosure. Applicants disagree.

In Duggal, nano-particles of the photo-luminescent material are dispersed in the organic EL material and the organic EL material emits a first electromagnetic radiation having a first spectrum in response to applied electric field. Then, the photo-luminescent material absorbs the first electromagnetic radiation emitted by the organic EL material and emits a second electromagnetic radiation having a second spectrum. In other words, the photo-luminescent material of Duggal does not emit *directly* in response to the applied electric field.

In contrast, the claimed inorganic phosphor layer or particle emits *directly in response to the applied electric field*. As such, it is clear that, at a minimum, Duggal fails to disclose the claimed inorganic phosphor layer and particle as recited by claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, claims 1 and 9 and all claims dependent thereon are patentable over Duggal. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-13 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duggal et al. in view of Bentsen et al. (US 2004/0214036). Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duggal et al. in view of Watanabe et al. (US 2002/0015859). Claims 19-21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duggal et al. in view of Koyama (US 2004/0207578). These rejections are traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants incorporate herein the arguments previously advanced in traversal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) predicated upon Duggal. The additional cited references do not teach or suggest the inorganic phosphor layer or particle which emits directly in response to

the applied electric field of amended claims 1 or 9, which is missing from Duggal. Therefore, any combination of Duggal with Bentsen, Watanabe or Koyama would still fail to disclose the claimed feature, and it would not have been obvious to add this feature to any such combination. Accordingly, claims 8, 14, 18-21 and 23 are patentable over the cited references. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 8, 14, 18-21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

New Claims

Since new claims depend upon claims 1, 9 or 23, these claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 9 or 23. Further, in claims 24-26, the organic material does not emit in response to applied electric field, which at least Duggal fails to disclose.

CONCLUSION

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:TS:MaM
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: May 29, 2009

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.**